
TRANSYLVANIAN REVIEW

Vol. XIX, Supplement No. 2, 2010

Worlds in Change II. Transforming East-Central Europe

Edited by

FLORIN FODOREAN • ALEXANDRU SIMON
• DANIEL MIHAIL ȘANDRU • ATTILA VARGA

ROMANIAN ACADEMY

Chairman:
Academician **Ionel Haiduc**

CENTER FOR
TRANSYLVANIAN STUDIES

Director:
Academician **Ioan-Aurel Pop**

Publication indexed and abstracted in the
Thomson Reuters Social Sciences Citation Index®,
in Social Scisearch® and in the Journal Citation
Reports/Social Sciences Edition,
and included in EBSCO's and ELSEVIER's products.

Transylvanian Review continues the tradition of **Revue de Transylvanie**, founded by Silviu Dragomir, which was published in Cluj and then in Sibiu between 1934 and 1944.

Transylvanian Review is published 4 times a year by the **Center for Transylvanian Studies** and the **Romanian Academy**.

EDITORIAL BOARD

CESARE ALZATI, Ph.D.

Facoltà di Scienze della Formazione, Istituto di Storia Moderna e Contemporanea, Università Cattolica, Milan, Italy

HORST FASSEL, Ph.D.

Institut für donauschwäbische Geschichte und Landeskunde, Tübingen, Germany

KONRAD GÜNDISCH, Ph.D.

Bundesinstitut für Kultur und Geschichte der Deutschen im östlichen Europa, Oldenburg, Germany

HARALD HEPPNER, Ph.D.

Institut für Geschichte, Graz, Austria

PAUL E. MICHELSON, Ph.D.

Huntington University, Indiana, USA

ALEXANDRU ZUB, Ph.D.

Chairman of the History Section of the Romanian Academy, Director of the A. D. Xenopol Institute of History, Iași, Romania

EDITORIAL STAFF

Ioan-Aurel Pop

Virgil Leon

Nicolae Bocșan

Daniela Mârza

Ioan Bolovan

Vasile Sălăjan

Raveca Divricean

Alexandru Simon

Maria Ghitta

Rudolf Gräf

Translated by

Bogdan Aldea—English

Liana Lăpădatu—French

Desktop Publishing

Edith Fogarasi

Cosmina Varga

Correspondence, manuscripts and books should be sent to: **Transylvanian Review**, **Centrul de Studii Transilvane** (Center for Transylvanian Studies) 12–14 Mihail Kogălniceanu St., 400084 Cluj-Napoca, Romania

cst@academia-cj.ro

www.centruldestudiitransilvane.ro

Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Editorial Notes | 7 |
| • I. Interdisciplinary Archaeological Researches | |
| I.1. The Legacy of the Remote Past | |
| Upper Palaeolithic Portable Art in South-Eastern and Mediterranean Europe Valentin-Codrin Chirica | 11 |
| Elements de sacralite de la violence en prehistoire Valentin-Codrin Chirica, George Bodi, Vasile Chirica | 27 |
| Palynological Research on Poduri – Dealul Ghindaru Settlement (Bacau County) Mihaela Danu, George Bodi | 59 |
| Human Remains Inside the Domestic Space Raluca Kogălniceanu | 67 |
| Les depots de bronzes entre les Carpates et le Dniestr Bogdan Petru Niculică | 85 |
| Shells as Supports for Body Ornaments in Cucuteni-Tripolie Culture Senica Țurcanu | 107 |
| Serghei Covalenco, Ion Tentiuc, Vitalie Burlacu Mădălin-Cornel Văleanu, Luminița Bejenaru, | |
| Preliminary Data on the Child's Tomb Discovered in the Paleolithic Site of Cosăuți (Republic of Moldova) Codrin Lacătușu | 123 |
| Some reflections on the prehistoric potter's craft from an ethnoarchaeological perspective Felix Adrian Tencariu | 129 |
| Aspects of Long Distance Trade by the Precucuteni Culture* Otis Crandell, Diana-Măriuca Vornicu | 139 |
| I.2. History and Historiography | |
| Human sacrifices at the Dacians? Răzvan Mateescu | 153 |
| Murus dacicus between function and symbol Luca – Paul Pupeză | 159 |
| The Road Sirmium – Singidunum in The Roman Itineraries Florin Fodorean | 171 |
| Disappeared Settlements of Arad County on the Austrian Military Maps of the 18 th and 19 th Century R. Rusu | 187 |
| Pierre Lapie, Louis Bonnefont, S. F. W. Hoffmann, and Roman Dacia Florin Fodorean | 201 |
| Medioplaticonic Aspects in Apuleius' Metamorphoses Cristian Baumgarten | 211 |
| La philosophie comme souci de soi chez Marc Aurèle Cristian Bejan | 225 |

• II. Freemasonry, Culture, Elites in Transylvania, Central-North Europe and America

| | |
|--|-----|
| The Swedish Order of Freemasons in the 18th Century | 245 |
| Tom Bergroth | |
| Aspects of Lucian Blaga's Metaphysics Reception in the Romanian Philosophical Culture | 257 |
| Ionuț Isac | |
| Changes of Slovak Freemasonry in the Twentieth Century. Brotherhood as Symbol of the Fight Against Totality | 269 |
| Martin Javor | |
| Cuba, Communism and the Craft | 279 |
| Allison Olivia Ramsay | |
| Riflessioni sulla vita di un "frammassone fuggente". | 303 |
| Gabriela Rus | |
| "From Darkness to Light": The Engravings of Ștefan P. Niagoe's Calendars, Buda, 1829 and 1830 | 309 |
| Anca Elisabeta Tatay | |
| Between Sociology and History: the Freemason Jászi Oszkár and the Nationality Issue in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy | 319 |
| Varga Attila, Rudolf Cristian | |
| Central European Federation Projects During World War I | 329 |
| Lakatos Artur | |

• III. Administrative, Legal and Philosophical Constructs

| | |
|--|-----|
| III.1. Medieval and Modern Thought | |
| Quantum potest et eductio formarum | 343 |
| Daniel Fărcaș | |
| Views on the Just War in Middle Ages. | 357 |
| Mihai Maga | |
| Saint Thomas, la censure universitaire du 7 mars 1277 et la genèse de la modernité philosophique | 365 |
| Alexander Baumgarten | |
| Berkeley's Argument for the Existence of God in the Alciphron dialogue | 373 |
| Vlad Mureșan | |
| Fundamental Aspects of Schleiermacher's Ethics | 379 |
| Vlad Moldovan | |
| La modernité roumaine à l'âge de l'apprentissage politique | 393 |
| Raluca Alexandrescu | |
| Salomon Maimon and the 'Quid juris'-Problem | 419 |
| Andrei Todoca | |
| Heidegger und die Ethik: die Vollbringung des Anderen | 435 |
| Bogdan Mincă | |
| III.2. The Challenges and Structures of Modernity | |
| Culianu and the European philosophical inheritance | 449 |
| Liliana Sonea | |
| La production du savoir politique et sa portée méthodologique pour la modernité roumaine | 461 |
| Raluca Alexandrescu | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Chanoines roumains dans les grandes universités européennes pendant la seconde moitié du XIX ^e siècle Ioana Mihaela Bonda | 483 |
| Defining Populism and the Problem of Indeterminacy: Some Conceptual Considerations Camil-Alexandru Părvu | 493 |
| Revue de Transylvanie (1934-1944) : discours programmatique pour l'unité nationale Valentina Pricopie | 507 |
| La sphère publique roumaine : la tentation de la modernisation Luminița Roșca | 517 |

III.3. Shaping Recent History

| | |
|--|-----|
| Metaphysics According to Ion Petrovici Claudia Renata David | 533 |
| Towards Formulating Some Theoretical Principles to Evaluate the Accuracy of Translating a Medieval Theological Text. Wilhelm Tauwinkl | 555 |
| Culianu and the European philosophical inheritance Liliana Sonea | 569 |
| Expectation of Europe and after? Valentina Pricopie | 585 |
| Consistencies and inconsistencies in drafting questions referred to the European Court of Justice for preliminary rulings by the Romanian courts Daniel Mihail Șandru | 595 |
| Measures and Decisions of Economic Stability from the Perspective of the European Monetary Union Codruța Mare | 611 |

• IV. Administrative, Legal and Philosophical Constructs

IV.1. Lands and Means of Faith

| | |
|---|-----|
| Byzantine Latin Ideology and the Clash with the Latin West Bogdan-Petru Malcon | 651 |
| Good Guy – Bad Guy: Zum Rollenspiel von Kaiser und Patriarch am Vorabend des 4. Kreuzzuges Christian Gastgeber | 673 |
| The Transylvanian I Anthro-po-Toponymy in the 13th Century. Victor V. Vizauer | 711 |
| Pier Paolo Vergerio il Vecchio, referendario dell'imperatore Sigismondo Adriano Papo | 723 |
| Sigismund von Luxemburg (1368-1437) in der Darstellung von Jan Długosz Krzysztof Baczowski | 735 |
| The Wallachians and their Churches: Perspectives on the Limits of a Crusader Cycle Alexandru Simon | 747 |

IV.2. Terms of Expansion and Regression

| | |
|--|-----|
| Economia di guerra, economia di pace, economia di frontiera Andrea Fara | 807 |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| Historiography in the Age of Matthias Corvinus | 849 |
| László Veszprémy | |
| Wienna caput Austrie ad Vngaros pervenit. Matthias Corvinus und Wien | 861 |
| Ferdinand Opll | |
| Mattia Corvino e Firenze: Rapporti culturali e nuove acquisizioni di testimoni manoscritti | 889 |
| Gianluca Masi | |
| Christian Survival and Redemption and the Eastern Expansion of the Ottoman Empire | 913 |
| Alexandru Simon | |
| Un noble serbe du Banat au XVe siècle: Miloš Belmužević | 941 |
| Adrian Magina | |

IV.3. Relations between Centres and Borders

| | |
|--|------|
| Spuren einer vom niederen Adel ausgeübten Autonomie im Siebenbürgen des ausgehenden 14. Jahrhunderts | 955 |
| Szilárd Süttő | |
| Filippo Scolari, un condottiero fiorentino al servizio di Sigismondo di Lussemburgo | 965 |
| Gizella Nemeth | |
| De la couronne contrôlée par le roi à la Sainte Couronne surveillée par les Ordres de la Hongrie | 977 |
| Iván Bertényi | |
| Le milieu culturel, religieux et politique de Bratislava à l'époque de Mathias Corvin | 985 |
| Eva Frimmová | |
| L'orientation de la politique de Mathias Corvin envers la principauté de Valachie à la suite de la destitution de Vlad Țepeș (1462) | 1011 |
| Guillaume Durand | |
| Treaties and Legacies of Crisis | 1031 |
| Alexandru Simon | |

IV.4. Paths and Patterns of Power

| | |
|---|------|
| Hereditary Countships in the Age of Sigismund of Luxemburg* | 1081 |
| Norbert C. Tóth | |
| Les nobles et les knèzes roumains au temps des luttes de Sigismond de Luxembourg pour la consolidation de son règne | 1093 |
| Ioan Drăgan | |
| King Sigismund and his Efforts to end the Schism in 1415 | 1101 |
| Ferenc Sebök | |
| Matthias Corvinus und die nordungarischen Städte | 1109 |
| Ján Lukačka | |
| Matthias Corvinus und Kasimir der Jagiellone angesichts der türkischen Gefahr in der zweiten Hälfte des 15. Jahrhunderts | 1117 |
| Krzysztof Baczowski | |
| The Habsburgs, the Hungarian Crown and Crusading in the East: From Rákös to Rákös | 1131 |
| Alexandru Simon | |

| | |
|--------------------------|------|
| • List of Authors | 1149 |
|--------------------------|------|

4. PATHS AND PATTERNS OF POWER

Hereditary Countships in the Age of Sigismund of Luxemburg*

NORBERT C. TÓTH

MEDIEVAL HEREDITARY countships were most thoroughly discussed by Imre Hajnik in his monograph on the subject¹. In his work he was able to prove in the case of altogether 39 (from the middle ages 15) counties that until 1870 these were led by – for a shorter or longer period – high ranking officials or members of the secular aristocracy (or families) as hereditary counts. His results were detailed by the late András Kubinyi in his essay on the counties at the end of Matthias Corvinus' reign².

Before entering the discussion, we must define, what the term *comes perpetuus* (an English translation would read *hereditary count*) exactly meant. First of all, the person named as hereditary count possessed territorial power over his county. Therefore in the present study I tend to deal only with those records in which the expression occurs in connection with a county in Hungary. For this reason the administrator of the Bishopric of Eger, Benedict Makrai, and his hereditary countship of the Lateran³ or the voivode Stibor's and his son, with their title *hereditary count of the River Vág*⁴ will not be discussed (in spite of the fact that the latter title covered an effective territorial power). On the basis of our analysis we can state that the mission of a hereditary count (*comes perpetuus*) did not differ from that of the ordinary count, devoid of any attributes. He similarly had the duty to guard and protect the county nobility, its rights and privileges. He was in charge of the observation of royal charters and mandates, and fur-

*. Research supported by the Bolyai János Kutatási Ösztöndíj [János Bolyai Research Grant] (BO/00433/06).

thermore it was his duty to supervise the collection of royal revenues, to maintain the free circulation of currency and the transportation of salt⁵.

The only essential difference between the two offices was that while the appointment of an ordinary count as head of a county lasted for the time of the king's satisfaction (*durante beneplacito* or *usque beneplacitum*)⁶, the person bearing the title of hereditary count possessed it until his death. If the person possessing a hereditary countship happened to be a clergyman, principally an archbishop or a bishop, his successor in his dignitary certainly obtained the given countship. In the other case, if the person entitled to be a hereditary count was a laic, then the given countship was inherited by (one or more of the) members of his family.

Consequently it can well be stated, that difference between officials named as count and hereditary count consisted neither in their duties, nor in the powers wielded by them, but in the bequeathability of the office. Unlike the first title, the latter could be bequeathed. This was expressed by the adjective *perpetuus* appearing beside the word *comes*: the title countship was for ever donated by the king to the given person and through him to the authority led by him, or to his family descending from him.

The series of hereditary countships indisputably began with the Esztergom County, governed since 1270 by the prevailing archbishops⁷. In the Anjou age, three other counties followed: Veszprém, Nitra and Győr. The local bishops took the lead of the county lending their name to their residence in 1313. These countships were said to be perpetual. Yet, they lasted only slightly longer than a decade. After increasing his power (by 1318/1323), Charles I Robert withdrew the appointments⁸. As to the question of whether or not the archbishop of Esztergom endured a similar loss of the title and power, the answer is certainly no. Boleslaw Piast (1321–1328) bore the title as well as his successors: Nicholas Dörögdi (1329–1330), Csanád Telegdi (1330–1349) and Nicholas Vásári (1350–1358). The series could be continued throughout the reign of king Sigismund⁹.

During the reign of Louis I, son of Charles I, there was only a single change, i.e. the priors of Vrána obtained in 1353 the hereditary countship of the small Dubica County (Bosnia)¹⁰. This situation did not change under Sigismund's government either, although there are data proving it only in connection with prior Imre Bebek (son of the palatine Detre), who is mentioned both in 1401¹¹ and 1402¹² with the title. After 1404 Sigismund did not fill the priory and had it governed usually by the Slavonian bans, who entrusted with the effective leadership of the priory their *familiaris*, the counts of Dubica. Thus until 1417, the nomination of Albert Nagymihályi Ungi to the priory the situation turned upside down for a short period, before getting finally back to normal. During his priory (1417–1433) Nagymihályi never indicated his hereditary countship

of Dubica, by all means because he was Croatian-Dalmatian ban at the same time¹³. Following his death the priory remained in vacancy again and this time was governed by Matkó Tallóci, who – possessing other positions of major importance – also did not stand in need of emphasizing his hereditary countship of Dubica.

Sigismund's accession to the throne brought a sudden change in the number of hereditary countships in Hungary. It was the bishop of Veszprém, who received the hereditary countship of his county first¹⁴. As previously mentioned, this was by no means without precedent, as the bishops of Veszprem had already held the office between 1313 and 1323. However. Nonetheless, it is worth noticing that in the charter of 1392 the perpetual donation of the countship is not mentioned word for word. In its context we can find only the fact – as in the case of all other appointments as counts – that the king donates the countship to bishop Maternus for his services *pro honore*. That this certainly indicates the office of hereditary count is fairly visible from later data, in which the castellans of Veszprém or (sometimes) Essegvár, castles ruled by the bishop of Veszprém, are at the same time vice-counts of the county¹⁵. Moreover, some of the later bishops, such as Simon Rozgonyi (1428-1439), in the *intitulatio* of a county charter in 1428, and in a bishopric charter of himself in 1439, is indicated as hereditary count¹⁶.

From what consideration did Sigismund grant the countship to the bishop? The answer is not difficult at all, especially if we bear two essential aspects in mind. The countship of Veszprém was possessed by Stephen Lackfi until early November, 1392, when he was also relieved by the king of his office of palatine¹⁷. Second, the bishopric see of Veszprém had been taken up by Maternus, one of the king's tutors in his youth a bit earlier, in the spring of the same year¹⁸. And although Maternus was promoted to the bishopric of Transylvania three years later, the bishops succeeding him – as we have seen above – retained the countship¹⁹. Thus a strong royal foothold was established in the centre of Transdanubia, from where the king, through the bishops nominated by himself, could keep an eye on the possible disloyal forces of the region.

The next well-known grant took place on 27th January, 1399. According to it, Sigismund – considering his services – donated to Hermann II von Cilli/Celje the Varasd County together with the castles within its territory. Although the term *comes perpetuus* does not appear in this charter either, from the description of the grant it is obvious, that it was intended and perceived as such by his contemporaries. It was not just Hermann who received the countship of Varasd, but his descendants and heirs too.

In contrast to the Hungarian practice the procedure of succession was regulated with over-scrupulous precision: after the death of Hermann II, in case he outlived Hermann II, Hermann II's middle son, Hermann (III) was to inherit Varasd County. If Herman died before his father or did not have any male

heirs, then the youngest son, Louis became heir to the county. The eldest son, Frederick was allowed to inherit only in case his younger brothers died before him and none of them had male heirs.

Eventually, it was Frederick alone who outlived his father. He and – later – his son, Ulrich took over the Varasd County and countship.²⁰ Hermann II and his eldest son, Frederick were on extremely bad terms, Frederick was even kept in capture by his father, because he had his wife, Elisabeth Frangepan/ Frankopane, murdered in 1422²¹ He avoided a more serious punishment most likely because his brothers were already dead at that time.

Aside from the two, by now examined donations of hereditary countship, the matter arises in connection with three other counties, headed not by functionaries appointed by the king, but by bishops or archbishops as hereditary counts. Unfortunately one of these three hereditary count-ships (i.e. the hypothetical hereditary countship of the bishop of Vác) has to be abandoned at once, as this matter was not included in the original charter²² In case of the other two, however, we can cite the existing sources to support our statements. First let us examine the county appearing earlier as hereditary countship.

In 1394 in the charter of the bishop of Nitra, Michael beside his title of bishop one can find the expression *hereditary count*²³. This mention also comes up in the charter of several parish priests of the diocese of Győr (1402), where the bishop of Nitra, Peter, is also mentioned as hereditary count.²⁴ Moreover, his successor and brother Hinko is repeatedly called himself hereditary count from 1413 on²⁵. Based on these sources, we can state that all bishops of Nitra, from 1393 to 1428 (Michael Kápolnai, Peter and Hinko)²⁶ were also hereditary count. Unfortunately as no charters survived from the time of George Berzevici (1429-1437), we cannot examine the period (the same applies also to Hinko's time in office, after 1422).

The question is how the hereditary countship of the bishops of Nitra fits into the series of the counts of Nitra heading the county in that period. As to the data on the counts of Nitra, it is obvious that the office of count was held by Dezső Serkei (1390-1392), by the Transylvanian voivode, Stibor²⁷ (until 1414) and by Peter Forgács (from 1403 to 1422). The reason for this 'joint countship' is that Forgács headed the county as Stibor's man, similarly to other counties where he had been vice-count on Stibor's behalf. This parallel bearing of functions did not meet difficulties also because Stibor possessed so many offices in the different corners of the country (i.e. he was the voivode of Transsylvania and the count of Bratislava at the same time), that he had to solve his deputyship by all means. After his lord's death in 1414, Peter Forgács continued to bear the countship, probably in the name of the younger Stibor²⁸. It seems, that in 1422 Peter, who was at the same time master of janitors (*magister ianitorum regal-*

ium) untill queen Barbara fell out of favour, left his office and retired to his estates. He was followed by Stibor the Younger at the head of the county. But he could not bear the countship for too long. By the end of 1424 the king relieved him of his office. Sigismund appointed marshal (*magister agazonum regalium*) Nicholas Perényi of Patak as count of Nitra. His promotion was obviously related to the Hussites' raids, since he became count of Trenčín, Bars, Maramureş and Zemplén, and captain of the Vág region (1421–1428), all at the same time²⁹.

The countship and title of hereditary count (1394–1421) of the above-mentioned bishops of Nitra, Michael Kápolnai (1393–1399), Peter (1399–1405) and Hinko (1405–1428) is in perfect accordance with the domination of the Stibors of the county. Is it possible to demonstrate, or can we demonstrate this clear subordination by sources?

The first bishop, Michael is by no means unknown, as he appears in the sources from 1381 on. He was a canon in Óbuda and royal steward (1381–1393). In the meantime, in 1383, he bore the office *comes lucri camere* (overseer of the benefit of the chamber). Beside the canonry stall he was provost of Titel. In 1393 he was promoted to the bishopric of Nitra. From 1399 on until his death (1402–1403), he served as bishop of Veszprém³⁰. As far as we known, his career and origins (from the Vas County) were not at all connected to the offices held by Stibor.

Michael's successor was Peter. He was of Polish origin³¹, based on which we can state that his arrival in Hungary was certainly related to that of Stibor. In this case, he was indebted to Stibor for his nomination as bishop of Nitra. Unfortunately we have no information on him. The dignities held prior to his nomination or those received after his stay in Nitra (in case he did not die there) remain unknown. In return, Peter's successor is rather well-known to scholars.

Hinko was Stibor's man of Bohemian or Moravian origin³². His lord first obtained for him the abbacy of Zombor. It is uncertain whether or not this was his first dignity for, while Stibor was voivode of Transylvania, a certain Hincó was the *custos* of the Transylvanian chapter, between January 31, 1397, and July 7, 1400, and between June 14, 1405 and April 30, 1406. Inasmuch as the two were the same person, his relationship with Stibor would date back to this time³³.

Hinko first appeared as the governor of the abbacy of Zombor on the 13th of November 1400. He bore this title, for almost three decades, until his death³⁴. After the death of bishop Peter, Stibor secured for Hinko the bishopric of Nitra, which he received from Sigismund prior to May 29, 1405 (the papal confirmation was issued prior to September 28, 1407)³⁵. He headed the bishopric until his death; he was still alive on May 27, 1428.

Soon after his nomination Hinko called several people of Bohemian or Moravian origin: *Nelephyán*, castellan of Skačany in 1409, and his name-sake Hinko, castellan of Skačany (1411–1423). Castle Nitra was also led by one of his men, *Jan* (1409–1417; we also know of a castellan Illés, in 1410). Then he appointed his rela-

tive Stibor as castellan of Nitra (1423-1425) and Skačany³⁶. Another relative of him was also mentioned in the sources³⁷. Another functionary of the bishop comes up in the sources. In 1412, the bishop arranged for the blood-money of a bishopric official, a certain *Hench*³⁸.

Hinko's partner at the head of Nitra County was another of Stibor's men, count Peter Forgács. They appear together several times in different cases: in 1417 in the seal-investigation process of the convent of Garamszentbenedek, in 1418, when the king commissioned them to defend the Paulites in Elefánt (Lefantovce) against Peter Lévai Cseh³⁹. Surprisingly, and rather unusually for a bishop, in 1412 he appears as royal man (*homo regius*) carrying out readjustment (*reambulatio*) of boundaries⁴⁰.

After all, it is no wonder, that the following person mentioned as hereditary count of Nitra was also a clergyman. Before disclosing his identity, it is worth to take a look at the time following the reign of Sigismund.

Nominating clergymen and laics as hereditary counts became more common especially during the reign of Matthias Corvinus, though the bishops of Győr had already (re)gained already their hereditary countship of Győr from Ladislas V (1452)⁴¹. In 1464, the bishop of Oradea became the hereditary count of Bihar. In 1472, the bishop of Eger became the hereditary count of Heves. In 1478, the bishop of Pécs became the hereditary count of Baranya. Furthermore, in 1468, the king confirmed the hereditary countship of the bishop of Nitra. Amongst the laics, the Szapolyais received the hereditary countship of the Zips County (1465), János Ernuszt the countship of Turóc (1470), the Bánfis of Alsókindva the countship of Arad (1471, but soon lost it) and of Verőce (1488)⁴². In the Jagello age, three more counties were coupled with these: the Perényis received the Abaúj County prior to 1504,⁴³ while the Drágfis of Béltek received the counties of Interior Szolnok and Crasna prior to 1526⁴⁴.

Scholarly opinions on the hereditary countship of the Bács County of the archbishops of Kalocsa strongly differ. Imre Hajnik, citing György Pray, committed himself to the date 1464. Moreover, he cited a data from 1444 as well⁴⁵. András Kubinyi presented arguments for the year 1478. Indeed, arguments can be advanced for both sides.

In the first case, a parallel offers itself: the bishop of Oradea obtained the hereditary countship of Bihar County at the Diet after Matthias' coronation of 1464. For the latter case, however, speaks the fact that the county was under the power of the Machovian bans. Their office was wound up only after the death of Nicholas Újlaki (1478). Kubinyi also suggested the possibility that the archbishops of Kalocsa obtained the countship earlier and precisely in order to keep an eye on the bans⁴⁶. Though the arguments of both sides are acceptable,

the hereditary countship of the arch-bishops of Kalocsa can be rooted back much earlier, to the first half of Sigismund's reign.

On May 8, 1398 the archbishop of Kalocsa and Bács united Churches, in accordance with canon law, Nicholas Bebek issued a charter as *loci dicte Colocensis comes perpetuus* on behalf of the armed nobles of the Church⁴⁷. How can we translate or interpret this expression? First, let us see the alternatives: the county of the archbishopric see, Fejér may come into consideration, but there are also two counter-arguments. In the first place, the count of Fejér County of the period is well-known, accidentally the palatine Detre Bebek,⁴⁸ father of the archbishop. Secondly, it was only a part of the county, the later Solt-district (*szék*), that belonged to the diocese of Kalocsa and – by that time – has not yet been separated from the mother-county⁴⁹. As a result of this we have to conclude, that the expression is a strong abridgement of the self-denomination appearing in the archbishop's title, and the prelate was the hereditary count of the county incorporating the other archbishopric seat, namely Bács.

In the case of Bács County too, it is worth also to compare our data with the list of the known counts. At the beginning of king Sigismund's reign, Francis Bebek and John Maróti, bans of Mačva (1399). In 1405, Ladislav Szilágyi was vice-count. Afterwards, for 25 years, no other counts of Bács are recorded.

Scholars responded to this unusual situation by claiming that no counts were recorded because the county was under the control of the bans of Mačva. Still, Nicholas Bebek was recorded as a hereditary count exactly in the time span from which we possess no other data on the counts of Bács. On the other hand Ladislav Szilágyi was mentioned as count, when the archbishopric was headed by a laic governor, the ban of Mačva⁵⁰.

Noticeably in 1398 there were two Bebeks (though not from the same branch of the family) at the head of both the archbishopric of Kalocsa and the Banate of Mačva. Yet by examining the names of the officials, the list can be expanded (we only study the functionaries in office after 1387).

The head of the family, Detre was the master of the queen's court (*magister curiae reginalis*) in 1388. He was ban of Slavonia (1389-1392, 1394-1397) and meanwhile ban of Severin and count of Timiș. Finally, he was palatine and count of several counties (1397-1402). One of his sons⁵¹, the abovementioned Nicholas, was provost of Csázma (1388), of Transylvania (1388-1390), of Eger (1390-1392), and the archbishop of Kalocsa (1392-1399). His other son, Imre was prior of Vrána (1392-1404), ban of Dalmatia and Croatia (1402) (as both sons were under age when they obtained their first honors, their father was in fact in control). Detre's brother, Imre was lord chief justice (*iudex curiae*) (1386-1392), count of Bereg (1388), count of Liptó and Turóc (1390-1392), voivode of Transylvania (1392-1393), and then the master of the queen's treasury and count of Borsod (1393-1395). Detre's cousin, Francis was the queen's

master of janitors (1388-1395) and meanwhile count of count of Abaúj and castellan of Diósgyőr (1390-1392), and then count of the Szeklers (1395-1397) and ban of Mačva (1397-1400)⁵².

Due to the ecclesiastical and secular positions, six – in fact only five, as we have seen – members of the Bebek family, controlled the part of the country situated south of the river Dráva, the mid and eastern part of northern Hungary, and the southern part of the territory between the Danube and the Tisa (1387-1400). After examining also the hereditary countship of the bishops of Nitra, we can conclude that this completed the power exerted by Stibor and his *familiaris* in north-western Hungary: Stibor was between count of Bratislava (1389-1402), of Trenčín (1392-1401), Nitra (1392-1414) and voivode of Transylvania (1395-1401, 1409-1414)⁵³.

What does this mean? On one hand, the secular functionaries exerting power over a certain territory tended to draw the major ecclesiastic institutions within their territory under their influence. This implied, that – in essence – the territorial landlord requested the king to appoint his own man to the head of the local Church, who proposed his adherent's candidate to the pope for the office.

Against our expectations, such pursuit of secular office suited the king. If the opportunity presented itself, the king himself did not nominate any-one to the head of a vacant archbishopric or bishopric, but instead of this nominated a laic administrator, who collected the income of the Church in his name. It was a practice not so different from that of the appointment of a adherent to a ecclesiastical seat. For instance, Sigismund appointed a relative of Pipo Ozorai, Andrea Scolari as bishop of Oradea. Another, Carnianus, became archbishop of Kalocsa. Others acted in a similar method.

It is unclear how this worked exactly in the late 1390s. However, due to the private archives of the chapter of Szepes, we know how a promotion took place in the 1410s. Soon after he was appointed lord chief justice (1409), the count of Sáros, Simon Rozgonyi, removed the *lector* of the chapter of Szepes, Arnold Mocsolai from his benefice and induced the king to grant it his son, Simon. After Simon Rozgonyi's promotion to the seat of provost of Sibiu, he gave it to cardinal John Kanizsai's two chaplains. It was the (at that time) usurper Andrew Edelényi who received it from the archbishop⁵⁴.

At the beginning of Matthias' reign, this method of appointment took its form in the charters, precisely in connection with one of the bishoprics discussed above. In the spring of 1458 the king granted the right of patronage (*ius patronatus*) over the bishopric and the right to fill it to the master of court (*magister curiae regiae*) Michael Gúti Ország and to his family, on the interesting account that the estates of the family surrounded the bishopric and its estates and thus the Ország family could easily defend it⁵⁵. The spending of revenues obtained in this manner did not differ from that of ordinary revenues: it usually served military purposes.⁵⁶

It seems that none of the abovementioned two hereditary countships established during Sigismund's reign survived after the king's death, although the archbishop of Kalocsa, Giovanni Buondelmonte (1425-1435, 1438-1447)⁵⁷ in his letter written to the vicar of TŰşnad (May 30, 1438), entitled himself hereditary count⁵⁸. The temporary disappearance of the hereditary countships of the two dignitaries and the reasons for it can be specified properly on the basis of our sources.

Both countships were the result of an excess in personal (Stibor's case) or family (the case of the Bebeks) power in the given territories. The mass of power gathered by Stibor reflected the royal will. The hereditary countship developed in the area of the Bebeks was a result of the king's exigency. They concurred at one point: the actual power over both bishop-rics was held by secular lords and their *familiaris*. As the establishment of this 'system' did not represent the king's initiative, after 1403 and the consolidation of Sigismund's rule, the bishops could hold on their (titular) hereditary countship only in the Nitra County (for a while), in Stibor's lands. As soon as Sigismund removed the Stibor the Younger from countship, bishop Hinko's title of hereditary countship disappeared, although he retained his seat.

The possibility that the donation of titles of hereditary count to the archbishop of Kalocsa and the bishop of Nitra was not invented by Sigismund is also obvious from later issues. Although the king used to promote his adherent's candidates – and also relatives – even later to different offices, these people – according to our knowledge – never appeared at the head of their county. On the other hand, the idea is supported by the survival of the hereditary countship granted to the Cillys and to the bishop of Veszprém throughout the whole age, inasmuch as these two donations of hereditary countship arose from the king's free will.

□

Notes

1. Imre Hajnik, *Az örökös főispánság a magyar alkotmánytörténetben* [Hereditary Countship in Hungarian Constitutional History] (=offprint *Értekezések a Történelmi Tudományok Köréből* [Memoirs of the Historical Section <of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences>], XIII, 10) (Budapest, 1888).
2. 'A megyéispánságok 1490-ben és Corvin János trónörökösödésének problémái' [The Counties in 1490 and the Problems of John Corvinus' Accession to the Throne.] *Veszprém Megyei Múzeumok Közleményei* [Studies of the Museum of the Veszprém County], XVI (1982), pp. 169-180.
3. *Zsigmondkori Oklevéltár* [Documentary Archive of Sigismund's Age], I-IX, general-editor(s) Elemer Mályusz <and> Iván Borsa (Budapest, 1951-2004); VII, no. 2265 (*Zsigmond*): *comes perpetuus sacri Lateranensis pallatii ac gubernator episcopatus ecclesie Agriensis*.

4. *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen*, I-VII, editors Franz Zimmermann, Karl Wagner, Gustav Gündisch, Konrad G. Gündisch (Hermannstadt-Bucharest 1892-1991); III, p. 527 (*Ub.*): *fluvii Wag dominus perpetuus*; *Zsigmond*, II, nos. 2903, 3608, 7826; his son: V, no. 1386; VI, nos. 2437, 2444; VII, no. 2445: *dominus totius fluvii Wag* and its variables.
5. Cf. *A Zichy és Vasonkeői gróf Zichy család idősb ágának okmánytára* [The Documentary Archive of the County of Zichy], I-XII, [general-] editor Ernő Kammerer (Budapest, 1876-1931); IX, p. 343, from 1453 (*Zichy*).
6. See in the charters from Sigismund's age appointing counts: count of the Szeklers, 1391: *Zsigmond*, I, no. 1951; Sáros County, 1397: *Zsigmond*, I, no. 4926; Bratislava County, 1421: György Fejér, *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ac ec-clesiasticus ac civilis* (Buda, 1829-1844); X-6, p. 403 (*Fejér*); Zala County, 1424: Magyar Országos Levéltár [The Hungarian National Archives], Budapest (MOL), Diplomatikai Levéltár [Diplomatic Archive] (DL), [no.] 92653; Szabolcs County, 1435: *Zichy*, XII, p. 150; Szepes County, 1437: MOL, DL 13005.
7. Hajnik, *Örökös főispán*, p. 55.
8. Richárd Horváth: *Győr megye hatóságának oklevelei 1318–1525* [Charters of Győr County 1318–1525] (Győr, 2005), pp. 16-21.
9. Some data: 1327: *Codex diplomaticus Hungaricus Andegavensis. Anjou-kori okmánytár* (= *Monumenta Hungariae Historica*, I-7), I-VII, edited by Imre Nagy, Gyula Tasnádi Nagy (Budapest, 1878-1920), II, p. 308 (CDHA); 1329: *Anjou-kori oklevéltár. Documenta res Hungaricas tempore regum Andegavensium illustrantia, 1301-1387*, I-XXVI, general editor Gyula Kristó (Szeged, 1990-2007), XIII, no. 590; 1340: CDHA, IV, p. 52; 1358: *Monumenta ecclesiae Strigoniensis*, IV, edited by Gábor Dreska, Géza Érszegi, András Hegedűs, Tibor Neumann, Kornel Szovák, István Tringli (Esztergom-Budapest, 1999), no. 66, p. 96 (about archbishop John Kanizsai); 1394: *Zsigmond*, I, nos. 3526; 1399: *Zsigmond*, I, no. 5983; 1404: *Zsigmond*, II, no. 3430; 1412: *Zsigmond*, III, nos. 1707, 1866, 2696, 2970, etc.
10. Pál Engel, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301-1457* [The Secular Archontology of Hungary. 1301-1457], I-II (Budapest 1996), I, p. 81 (*Archontológia*).
11. *Zsigmond*, II, no. 1051, *comes Dubychye perpetuus*.
12. *Monumenta historica episcopatus Zagradiensis*. V, 1395–1420, edited by Andreas Lukinović (Zagreb, 1992), no. 146, p. 161 (*perpetuus comes de Dubycha*). This charter is of major importance also because we learn from it, that the rebellious Hervoja and his Bosnian followers had previously occupied Dubica County, and it was re-conquered *recently* (*nuper*) by the ban together with his companion, Eberhard bishop of Zagreb and their soldiers *pro augmento honoris ipsius vestre Serenitatis* (sc. *regis*) *laborantibus predictum comitatum Dubichensem ad manus nostras iterum reapplicantibus*.
13. *Archontológia*, I, p. 82; II, p. 173. (1419: *Zsigmond*, VII, no. 759; 1421: *Zsigmond*, VIII, no. 198; 1423: *Zsigmond*, X, no. 1378; 1424: MOL, Diplomatikai Fényképgyűjtemény [Archive of Diplomatic Photocopies] (DF), [no.] 263106. 1425: MOL, DF 218697.
14. Hajnik, *Örökös főispán*, p. 93. (*Zsigmond*, I, no. 2701.)
15. Cf. *Archontológia* II, pp. 232-233.

16. *Archontológia*, II, p. 232. (MOL, DL 66253. *comes perpetuus comitatus Vespriemiensis*); DL 1026.
17. P. Engel, *Királyi hatalom és arisztokrácia viszonya a Zsigmond-korban* [Relationship between Royal Authority and Aristocracy in the Age of Sigismund] (1387–1437) (= *Értekezések a Történelmi Tudományok Köréből*, NS, LXXXIII) (Budapest, 1977), p. 36.
18. E. Mályusz *Zsigmond király uralma Magyarországon 1387–1437* [The Reign of King Sigismund in Hungary 1387–1437] (Budapest, 1984), p. 41.
19. *Archontológia*, I, p. 78.
20. *Fejér*, X-2, p. 633.; *Archontológia*, I, p. 223.
21. Engel, *Királyi hatalom*, o. 50.
22. *Zsigmond*, VI, no. 596. As in the extract stands: *András custos and canon in Vác*, vicarius in spiritualibus generalis of *Fülöp*, bishop and hereditary count of Vác, but in the charter itself (MOL, DL 69767.) one can read *domini Philipi Dei et apostolice sedis gratia episcopi loci eiusdem in spiritualibus ...*
23. *Zsigmond*, I, no. 3497. (MOL, DF 273138) *ac loci eiusdem comes perpetuus*.
24. *Zsigmond*, II, no. 2021.
25. József Vagner *Adalékok a nyitrai székes-káptalan történetéhez*. [Contributions to the History of the Chapter of Nitra] (Nyitra, 1896), no. 3, p. 28, 1414: *Zsigmond*, IV, no. 2246; 1417: *Zsigmond*, VII, no. 459; 1421: Vagner: *Adalékok*, p. 405: *comes perpetuus / locique eiusdem comes perpetuus*.
26. *Archontológia*, I, p. 72.
27. Though there is data about Stibor's countship in Nitra on September 8, 1400 (*Zsigmond*, II, no. 489.), the countship in Trencin, that he bore in parallel with that of Nitra, was governed by him from 1392.
28. *Archontológia*, I, pp. 160–161.
29. *Ibid.*, II, p. 189.
30. *Ibid.*, II, p. 124.
31. *Ibid.*, I, p. 72.
32. The latter is supported by two data: a. in 1413 in Kunovice, Moravia he bought a piece of estate. (*Zsigmond*, IV, no. 1132.) b. in 1421 his *familiaris*, Imre Simonyi's son, Nicholas defended the *oppidum* Kunovic against the Hussites (*Zsigmond*, VIII, no. 509.)
33. *Ub.*, III, pp. 173, 260, 339, 410.
34. *Zsigmond*, II, no. 625; 1403: *Fejér*, X-4, p. 253; 1404: *Zsigmond*, II, no. 3197.; 1406: *Zsigmond*, II, no. 4891; 1407: *Zsigmond*, II, no. 5625; 1409: *Zsigmond*, II, no. 7178; 1410: *Zsigmond*, II, nos. 7515, 8032; 1412: *Zsigmond*, III, no. 2111; 1415: *Zsigmond*, V, no. 722.
35. *Archontológia*, I, p. 72.
36. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 378., 432.
37. *Zsigmond*, X, no. 971.
38. *Ibid.*, III, no. 2290.
39. *Ibid.*, VI, nos. 622, 1632.
40. *Ibid.*, III, nos. 2687, 2988, 3086.

41. Győr megye hatóságának oklevelei, p. 24.
42. Hajnik, *Örökös főispán*, pp. 6, 44, 78, 84, 91; Kubinyi: 'Megyéspánságok', p. 169.
43. N.C. Tóth, *Szabolcs megye hatóságának oklevelei*, [Charters of Szabolcs County] II, 1387–1526 (Budapest–Nyíregyháza, 2003), no. 742, 209.
44. Hajnik: *Örökös főispán*, p. 63.
45. Ibid., p. 49; 1444: *Johannes [...] Colocensis et Bachiensis ecclesiarum canonice unitarum archiepiscopus locique eiusdem Colocensis comes perpetuus* (Hazai Oklevéltár 1234–1536 [Domestic Documents. 1234–1536], edited by I. Nagy, Farkas Deák, Farkas, Gy. Nagy (Budapest, 1879), p. 408).
46. Kubinyi, 'Megyéspánságok', p. 169.
47. *Zsigmond*, I, no. 5307.
48. *Archontológia*, I, p. 128.
49. Gyula Gábor, *A megyei intézmény alakulása és működése Nagy Lajos alatt*. [The Development and Functioning of County Authorities under Louis the Great] (Budapest, 1908), pp. 21–22.
50. *Archontológia*, I, p. 100.
51. Cf. Engel, *Királyi hatalom*, p. 36 (note 63).
52. *Archontológia*, II, pp. 26–27.
53. Ibid., II, p. 217.
54. *Zsigmond*, X, no. 382.
55. Tibor Neumann, 'Felső-Tisza-vidéki nemesek a késő középkori Nyitra megyében' [Nobles from the Upper-Tisza Area in Late Medieval Nitra County], *Szabolcs-Szatmar-Beregi Szemle* [Review of the Counties of Szabolcs, Szatmar and Bereg], XLII (2007), 4, 436.
56. N.C. Tóth 'Az esztergomi érseki szék üresedése 1418–1423 között' [Vacancy of the Primacy of Esztergom between 1418–1423], *Századok* [Centuries], CXXXVII (2003), 4, pp. 885–896.
57. *Archontológia*, I, p. 66.
58. Antal Fekete Nagy, 'A Petróczy levéltár középkori oklevelei' [Medieval Charters from the Archives of Bratislava], *Levéltári Közlemények* [Archival Studies], IX (1931), p. 83. (MOL, DL 39543.).

Abstract

Hereditary Countships in the Age of Sigismund of Luxemburg

Medieval hereditary countships were most thoroughly discussed by Imre Hajnik in his monograph on the subject. His results were detailed by the András Kubinyi in his essay on the counties at the end of Matthias Corvinus' reign. The present study aims at adding new perspectives on this special topic.

Keywords

Hereditary countships, Kingdom of Hungary, Bishops, Sigismund of Luxemburg, Nobility.